

# MEIGS COUNTY TIMES.

VOLUME I.

POMEROY, OHIO, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1844.

NUMBER 16

EDITED AND PRINTED WEEKLY BY  
Z. REATTY.

## [From the Zanesville Gazette] Spoiliations of the French Prior to 1800.

It is painful to witness delays of Justice in a Government claiming for itself the character of intelligence and uprightness. The subject we have just named is one in reference to which the "denial of right" seems exceedingly obvious and reprehensible.

Every one conversant with the transactions of the last seven years of the last century, know well that great depredations on our Commerce were committed in those years, under authority or countenance of the French Government—These aggressions produced a *quasi* war in 1798. A deputation of distinguished Americans—John Marshall, C. C. Pickney, and Eldridge Gerry—was sent by our Government to negotiate a settlement of differences with France. They were met by the celebrated Talleyrand—whose first claim was understood to be for ample bribes—"Il faut de l'argent, il faut beaucoup de l'argent." "We must have money,"—we must have a great deal of money." Our illustrious envoys returned without effecting any settlement. A new effort of peace with France was made by President Adams. The second extraordinary mission was composed of Chief Justice Ellsworth, William Vans Murray and Gen. Davis of North Carolina. In their instructions—October 2d, 1799—they were informed that the United States expected from France, "as an indispensable condition of the treaty, a stipulation to make the citizens of the United States full compensation for all losses and damages which they shall have sustained by reason of irregular or illegal captures, or condemnation of their vessels and other property, under color of authority or commissions from the French Republic or its agents."

The negotiation was long and arduous, and was concluded in the autumn of 1800, by a Convention in which questions of indemnity were postponed to a more "convenient time."

The French negotiators did not pretend to deny that indemnities were due our citizens; but, by way of effect, alleged that our Government had not fulfilled its treaties with France, and that indemnities were due also to her. This claim could not well be rebutted. On the 7th of July, 1798, the American government undertook formally and publicly to annul all existing treaties between France and the United States; and it did not wish to renew them.

The second article of this new Convention with France reads thus:

"Art. 2d. The plenipotentiary of the two parties not being able to agree at present, respecting the treaty of Alliance of the 6th of February, 1778, the treaty of Amity & Commerce of the same date, and the convention of the 14th of November, 1793, nor upon the indemnities mutually due or claimed, the parties will negotiate further on these subjects at a convenient time; and until they may have agreed upon these points, the said treaties and convention shall have no operation." &c.

This new convention was submitted by President Adams to the United States Senate in December, 1800, and by their approval, February 3d, 1801, excepting the aforesaid second article, and limiting the duration of the Convention to eight years. President Adams ratified accordingly. The French would not ratify, unless there should be an express mutual renunciation of claims and indemnities. And this was finally agreed to—thus:

"The Government of the United States having added to its ratification that the convention should be in force for the space of eight years, and having omitted the second article the government of the French Republic consents to accept, ratify and confirm the above convention with the addition importing that the convention shall be in force for the space of eight years, and with the retrenching of it of the second article; provided that by this retrenchment the two states renounce the respective pretensions which are the subject of the said article."

And thus the convention was mutually ratified, and the matters were finally settled, as between the two governments.

In this manner, and for valuable considerations, our government released France from the just claims for our citizens for unjust and illegal captures of their vessels and property on the high seas. Can any reasonable man doubt that our government released France from the just claims of our citizens for unjust and illegal captures of their vessels and property on the high seas. Can any reasonable man doubt that our government, having sold those claims, is justly bound to make reparation to those much injured and long suffering citizens?

Judge Marshall thought our government liable. Bonaparte, one of the French negotiators of the Convention, said, at St. Helena, that the suppression

of that second article annulled the claims of our citizens. Mr. Madison in an official paper, wrote thus:

"The claims again, from which France was released, were admitted by France, and the release was for a valuable consideration, in a correspondent release of the United States from various claims on them."

Is it not evident that our government is egregiously wrong in this matter?

## From the O. S. Journal. THE JACKSON MEN OF OHIO, ON THE TARIFF, IN 1821.—RE- MARKABLE AND CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE OF INCONSISTENCY PRODUCED! DISHONESTY PRO- VED!—THE WHIG PARTY OF OHIO STANDING ON THE TRUE DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM!!!

It may not be recollected by many, but it is none the less true that a Jackson Convention was held in Columbus on the 8th of January, 1823. That Convention issued an address, and General Jackson was in it eulogized. Among other subjects touched upon is that of a Protective Tariff. Many affirmed, and endeavored to create the belief, that General Jackson was hostile to a Protective Tariff. That address vindicates him from the charge as follows. We quote word for word, letter for letter, and point for point, from the original address; and ask that those who are following the Van Buren leaders in their opposition to a Protective Tariff mark well its import and paraphrase:

"They represent Gen. Jackson and his friends as opposed to the manufacturing interests of the nation. It is pretended that he will or that he must, in the event of his election to the presidency, oppose a tariff of protecting duties, by the power and influence of his office; and their assumption, in this instance, is equally unsupported by facts, and equally unwarranted by reason as the former. Nothing in the conduct of that illustrious citizen, or in his professions, authorizes such a presumption. His support of the protective tariff of 1821, while a senator in congress, is known to have been decided and energetic; and like himself, fearless, candid, and unwavering. In a letter written by him, while the bill was pending, to a gentleman in the south, who had solicited his opinion on the subject, we find the views and motives that governed him on that occasion. His opinions and sentiments on this interesting question of political economy and national policy, are given without disguise, and explained with remarkable clearness. From that letter we make the following extract:—

"So far as the tariff before us embraces the design of *forcing and preserving* within ourselves, the means of national defence and independence, particularly in a state of war, I would advocate and support it. Providence has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—rich lead, iron and copper, and given us climate and soil for the growth of hemp and wool. These being the grand materials of our national defence, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair PROTECTION, that our own manufactures and labor, may be placed on a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential in war. Beyond this, I look at the tariff with an eye to the proper distribution of labor, and to revenue, and with a view to the discharge of our national debt. I will ask, what is the real situation of the agriculturist?—Where has the American Farmer a market for his surplus products? Except for export he neither has a foreign or a home market. Does this not clearly prove, when there is no market either at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture, and that the channels for labor should be multiplied?—Common sense points out at once the remedy. Draw from agriculture this superabundant labor; employ it in *mechanism and manufactures*; thereby creating a home market for your breadstuffs, and distributing labor to the most profitable amount, and benefits to the country will result. In short, we have been too long subject to the policy of the British merchants. It is time we should become a little more AMERICANIZED."

The Address of the Jackson Convention of 1823, after introducing this letter, proceeds to say:—

"This letter has ever been considered in the character of a public document. It has been nearly four years before the nation, and constitutes as a pledge of Gen. Jackson's sentiments and opinions, on this interesting and important subject, as if it had been communicated to Congress as an official message, with all the formalities of office. After such a public avowal of his views of this great national policy, confirmed by his public acts, it is both unjust and dishonorable to impute to himself and friends a disposition to pursue an adverse policy. The encouragement of domestic manufactures and home industry, is a GRAND NATIONAL object, and has been pursued by different administrations of the Federal Government (with one exception) until the pres-

ent, with more perseverance than most other public interests. It has been uniformly recommended and supported by many of our orators and best of men; and in the speeches and messages of former Presidents (excepting those of the elder Adams,) is a prominent subject for the particular attention of the national legislature. But the present incumbent has not so considered it. In his first and second messages to Congress, he seems to have been aware that we possessed such "means of comfort, prosperity and happiness;" but we looked in vain in these documents, for any expression of his friendly views and opinions on the subject. Had he not been nationally to this branch of our internal policy, he would not have neglected to urge it upon the consideration of Congress, to whom he was required, from time to time, to recommend the adoption of such measures, as he should judge necessary and expedient. In his last message, from which much was expected, he observes a studied and portentous silence on this topic. The question then, necessarily presents itself, did he, or did he not judge it necessary and expedient that measures for promoting and protecting home manufacture, should be considered by Congress? If he did not, then he was right in neglecting to recommend it; if he did, where lies his excuse to the American people? His friends have framed one for him:—

"He left it to stand on its own claims, and left the statements of the appropriate department." The first part of this apology is as remarkable for the simplicity of the expression, as for its truth. He has indeed left the matter to stand upon its own claims; and leaving it so, has virtually abandoned a great national policy. The kind officiousness of friends will sometimes "encumber a man with help;" and, but for the anxious interests that dictated it, the President has little cause to be grateful for the apology."

Thus, then, as defined by an Ohio Jackson Convention, in 1823, was the doctrine, these the opinions and positions of Gen. Jackson and his supporters, at that time! Not content with indignantly denying assertions then made that General Jackson was not a friend of a Protective Tariff, they go further, and affirm that he is a more decided and determined friend of such a Tariff than J. Q. Adams himself, whose silence on the subject, in two of his messages, they construed into hostility! So exceedingly obnoxious was any man who hesitated to avow himself a friend of a Protective Tariff, in all its length and breadth, that the Jackson Convention of 1823, excepted materially to aid in the defeat of J. Q. Adams and the election of General Jackson by saying that the devotion of the former to the popular doctrine was somewhat questionable, while that of the latter, a two-standing the declarations of his enemies, was beyond all question! There is no mistaking of words or terms. Nothing about a judicious or revenue Tariff—a Protective Tariff was the word!

Now, in order to give the proper force to these declarations of sentiment as put forth by the Jackson Convention, held in this City, in 1823, and so show that the reckless, dishonest, and ignorant wire-pullers of Mr. Van Buren, of the present day, in this State, have entirely deserted and forsaken old Jackson Democracy, while their opponents, the Whigs of Ohio and of the Union stand on the true Democratic platform, on this question: we contrast them with the doctrines of the Address adopted and put forth by the Convention held in this City, on the 8th inst., and published in the Statesman. The denunciations of a Protective Tariff, in this Address, occupy a column. We quote the summing up as we have it in each paragraph of the column. Let those, if any there are, who question the fidelity and accuracy of our quotations, compare them with the original in the Statesman of the 11th, from which we quote.

"Because a Protective Tariff does no confer other special and exclusive privileges upon a few, the manufacturers not accorded to the many engaged in other pursuits."

"Because a Protective Tariff is a tax upon millions of men employed in the various mechanic arts, in planting, farming, commerce, and all the other multifarious pursuits of industry, for the peculiar benefit of comparative few thousands, engaged in manufacturing."

"Because a Protective Tariff increases the price of articles of consumption, whether imported, or manufactured in this country—while at the same time it diminishes the value of articles of production, and exportation."

"A Protective Tariff is, therefore, in truth a tax upon exports, which the government ought never to impose, directly or indirectly, by means of duties upon imports beyond what is indispensably necessary for competent revenue."

To the candid and honest voters of Ohio we would say, "Look on one picture, and then on the other!" Contrast and compare the declarations of opinion put forth. Examine your position! Look on what you stand! See the position in which unscrupulous demagogues, who have their own selfish aggrandizement only in view, have placed you, and to what end they would lead you. And say, after calm consideration, whether you are prepared to follow them longer in their destructive and anti-democratic course.

**RESIGNATION OF SENATOR SPRAGUE.**—We learn from the Providence Journal that the Hon. William Sprague has resigned his seat in the Senate of the United States, in consequence of the sudden and melancholy decease of his brother and partner in business, the late Amasa Sprague's resignation will of course be filled with a Whig.

A private letter from Washington says:—Commodore Stewart has been appointed Acting Secretary of the Navy, which post he is expected to occupy on Monday next. The Commodore has already reached Washington and has had an interview with the President upon the subject.

To fatten pork, at six cents, much judgment and economy are necessary.—If you purchase shoats, as they rise, from a drove, large boned, thick skinned, long snouted, long legged, with narrow backs, and keeping them on grain of your own raising, or from the city, or on potatoes, you will not be able to sell your pork for six cents per pound.

But if you have an excellent breed of your own, and can rear your pigs on milk, or whey, and other refuse matter, the waste of the house; you may save the trouble of being cheated in the name of Berkshire, and Byfield or Chinese; and may rear a thrifty and a more profitable lot of hogs than you can ever have by feeding, while young, on the best grain in the country.

Hogs fatten best on a variety,—and this may be more readily obtained when you begin to fatten early in the season.—No hog should exceed the age of 20 months, and an April pig will be old enough in Nov. of the next year. If your hogs are kept in good condition through July you will begin to fatten them as soon as haying is over. Then you will find a variety to feed on if you have saved some old corn or buckwheat to aid you.

Boiled potatoes, pumpkins, apples, squashes, and all garden vegetables will aid you to fill up and to season the supper; and sweet corn, greens, cobs, sulk and all, cut short, will be eaten; some meal always being necessary in your boiled mush. At six cents, however, a farmer expects no other pay for his labor in tending his hogs than the measure that is made in fattening them.—[Ploughman.

## A New Democratic Candidate for Governor.

Delazon Smith, late a delegate from Montgomery County to the "Democratic Convention" held at Columbus on the glorious 8th of January 1844, announces his intention "to run for Governor" at the next election, on his own hook.

We learn from the Dayton Journal, that he "defined his position" in a speech of about two hours last Thursday night, proclaiming the sentiments he now held in common "with Shannon, Hamer, Spalding" and others, in opposition to the nomination of Van Buren by the Locofoco party, and to "Cliques," big and little, which have controlled, and still seek to control the action of that party." We abstract what follows, from the Journal sketch of this speech. There will be rare sport in this, when Smith and Tod contend.

EXTRACT.

Gov Shannon (said Smith) was waited upon by Medary last spring, and directly questioned, touching his opinions in regard to the exclusive hard money doctrine.—"The Gov. in reply, gave Medary distinctly to understand that he had no faith in the doctrine, and would never give his assent to its establishment. From that moment Shannon was marked for political destruction. He could not be made a tool of, by the central clique, and the car of democracy was to roll over him, and crush him beneath its ponderous wheels. A selection was then made from amongst the party, of a candidate whose entire submission to the will of Medary and his associates could be relied on. Nor was action in the premises long delayed. David Tod was soon discovered to be a fit subject, and a course of management to bring him out was commenced. Tod came to Columbus. In company with Medary he visited Cincinnati, and some other places—the arrangements fully made.—Tod retired to his home—and McNulty, then editing a hard money paper, at Mount Vernon, in Knox county, was given to understand that he must lead off in favor of Governor Tod." And immediately the Tod flag was raised at the mast head of McNulty's paper, with a tremendous puff of the abilities and democracy of the newly found candidate. Some few other papers, all of the "hard money" stamp, followed suit. And then after all these demonstrations had been suggested and directed by Medary and his associates, the former copied into the Statesman those made to order "pulls," and claimed David Tod to be the choice of the democracy of the State! Thus was Gov. Shannon, unconsciously discarded, and thus was David Tod brought forth as the candidate of the party.

A majority of those who were appointed delegates from Montgomery county were Cass men. They were farmers—and perhaps had not the means to go to Columbus. But the "clique" remedied this difficulty. They loaded a wagon with delegates here in Dayton. Got them to Columbus some how or other, and they gave the vote of Montgomery for the Van Buren delegate to the National Convention.

—although a majority of the delegates appointed by the county convention were in favor of Gen. Cass. At the state convention, the same game was practiced. While but few of the members were present, the officers were appointed by the direction of the central clique. Resolutions in favor of Van Buren, "cut and dried for the occasion, were offered by Thurman, of Chillicothe, the brother-in-law of Bill Allen. The Cass men stood upon their rights, and although it was attempted to heat and gag them down, yet they related like men, and compelled the dictators to listen to them. But it was of no avail. The thing had been determined on by the clique, and the resolutions were passed.

"I give my Democratic friends notice that they need not expect much from Brother Tod. He is a very good natured gentleman, very honest for all I know, and talks a great deal about his 'democratic mother' and family—but he don't know much, and that they will find out, if he should travel this way. There seems now to be no way to avoid his defeat, by some 30,000 in the State—and some 500 in this very county. There is one way of accounting for the large majority against Tod—and that is by the announcement that I intend to run for Governor myself.

But Tod couldn't be elected with my aid. He is the Clique candidate—in favor of hard money—and there is no chance for him. You may talk as you please about the con skin orgies of 1840. You may say that the people were drunk when they defeated Mr. Van Buren, but you can't make it go down.

I here announce my intention of visiting every county in the State before the second Tuesday in October. The people shall know the trickery and rascality of these domineering cliques, who are so constantly at work to defeat an expression of the popular will among the Democratic party. I tell them their rogues shall not remain without exposure. Let them meet me upon the stump if they dare—and I give them notice that I am ready to meet them wherever they please. If they do not choose to take the stump, but expect to write me down, they must do something more than display the tea-spoonful of brains which marks the ability displayed in the Empire from week to week.

## MINORITY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CANALS.

The undersigned being of the Committee on Canals, to whom the petitions of sundry citizens of this State, praying "that the State Officers on our Canals may be instructed by specific enactment to transact no official business on the Lord's Day;" and being unable to agree to the report on this subject, made by the chairman of the committee, ask leave to present a counter report:

These petitioners ask in effect nothing more than the "Officers of the State" employed on our Canals be released by law from "the transaction of official business on the Lord's Day." Is there any thing unreasonable, improper, or impolitic, in their request? A brief examination of this question is all that is now designed. The constitution of this State declares that "religion, morality and knowledge," are "essentially necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind." It would be a useless waste of time to attempt to prove that the framers of this organic law, in thus declaring "religion essentially necessary to good government," referred to and adopted the christian religion as thus "necessary" not only to "good government" but also to the "happiness of mankind." It would be distrusting the intelligence of every citizen of this country to enter upon an argument to show that the christian religion enjoins the observance of one day in seven as the Sabbath, which is to be kept holy, or that the day thus to be observed, is the first day of the week. It may be well, however, to notice some of the legislative recognitions of the first day of the week, as the day which is set apart and deemed the Sabbath. The General assembly, by the express provisions of the constitution, meets annually on the first Monday of December, by which it is obvious the framers of that instrument designed to be understood, as declaring, that the first day of the week should not be devoted, even to the highly important duty of enacting laws for the "good government" or "happiness" of the people. The Legislature, at no time since the formation of the constitution, either in accordance with this provision, or in deference to the well understood wishes of the people, or perhaps in obedience to the higher and more sacred duty, enjoined by the law of God, has not designed to desecrate the Sabbath by holding its ordinary sessions on that day. It would be but to outrage the moral sense of our people, if our courts of justice were to transact business on that day; hence, all legislative enactments relative to the holding our courts, expressly set apart the Sabbath as a period too sacred to be